

CAI
XC2
- 1959
B65

Government
Publications

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-fourth Parliament

1959

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON
BROADCASTING

Chairman: G. E. HALPENNY, Esq.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 13

TUESDAY, JUNE 18, 1959

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

WITNESS:

Charles Jennings, Controller of Broadcasting, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1959

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON BROADCASTING

Chairman: G. E. Halpenny, Esq.

Vice-Chairman: J. Flynn, Esq.

and Messrs.

Miss Aitken,
R. A. Bell (*Carleton*),
Tom Bell (*Saint John-
Albert*),
Brassard (*Lapointe*),
Mrs. Casselman,
Chambers,
Dorion,
Eudes,
Fairfield,
Fisher,
Forgie,

Fortin,
Johnson,
Kucherepa,
Lambert,
Macquarrie,
Mitchell,
Morris,
Muir (*Lisgar*),
McCleave,
McGrath,
McIntosh,
McQuillan,

Nowlan,
Paul,
Pickersgill,
Pratt,
Richard (*Ottawa East*),
Robichaud,
Simpson,
Smith (*Calgary South*),
Smith (*Simcoe North*),
Taylor,
Tremblay.

J. E. O'Connor,
Clerk of the Committee.

CA1
XC 2
- 1959
B65

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, June 18, 1959.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 9.30 a.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. Halpenny, presided.

Members present: Miss Aitken, Mr. Bell (*Carleton*), Mrs. Casselman, and Messrs. Chambers, Dorion, Fairfield, Fisher, Flynn, Forgie, Halpenny, Johnson, Kucherepa, Macquarrie, Muir (*Lisgar*), McCleave, Pickersgill, Paul, Robichaud, Simpson, Smith (*Calgary South*), Smith (*Simcoe North*) and Tremblay. (22).

In attendance: From the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation: Messrs. R. L. Dunsmore, Chairman, Finance Committee, Board of Directors; M. Henderson, Comptroller; Marcel Carter, Controller of Management Planning and Development; Charles Jennings, Controller of Broadcasting; Marcel Ouimet, Deputy Controller of Broadcasting; R. C. Fraser, Director of Public Relations; R. E. Keddy, Director of Organization; J. J. Trainor, Assistant to Director of Audience Research; Barry MacDonald, Secretary, Board of Directors; and J. A. Halbert, Assistant Secretary, Board of Directors.

The Chairman observed the presence of quorum and read into the record a translation of a telegram signed by the following:

Mr. Jean-Louis Roux, President, *Société des auteurs dramatiques*;

Mr. Jean Duceppe, President, *Union des artistes*;

Mr. Fernand Quirion, President, *Association des réalisateurs*.

Agreed,—That in future all communications addressed to the Committee will be considered by the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure.

Agreed,—That the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure consider the desirability of giving a certain priority to Part "H" of the Agenda, that part relating to "New Developments".

Part "B" of the Agenda was called and Item 1—Comparison by Location of News Service—was allowed to stand.

Items 2, 3 and 4 relating to,

- (a) a review of Directive and Style Guide;
- (b) a review of the proposal to employ new staff to cover Parliamentary Proceedings; and
- (c) integration of supervisory and editorial staff of radio and television services,

were considered and questions were answered by Mr. Jennings.

The Chairman called for consideration, Part "C" of the Agenda—Controversial and Political Broadcasting—whereupon Mr. Forgie moved, seconded by Mr. Pickersgill; That the Premier of Ontario be invited to attend this Committee, and set forth his views and grievances against the C.B.C.

Moved by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Tremblay, that the motion be amended to read "That all provincial premiers and other prominent persons be invited to appear at the completion of the Committee's hearings". The amendment was negatived, NAYS: 9; YEAS: 7.

Moved by Mr. Flynn, seconded by Mr. Smith (*Calgary South*), that the motion be amended by the addition of the following words, "and that this be deferred until completion of the Agenda".

The motion, as amended, was resolved in the affirmative, YEAS: 12; NAYS: 5.

At 11.00 a.m. the Committee adjourned to meet again at 9.30 a.m., Monday, June 22, 1959.

J. E. O'Connor,
Clerk of the Committee.

NOTE: *Text of the Proceedings recorded in the French language appears immediately following the day's Evidence.*

REMARQUE: *Le texte des témoignages recueillis en français figure immédiatement à la suite du compte rendu des délibérations de la séance d'aujourd'hui.*

EVIDENCE

WEDNESDAY, June 17, 1959.

9:30 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have a quorum. Mr. Bushnell is ill this morning and will not be here. Therefore, Mr. Jennings will sit beside me.

I received a letter from three groups in Montreal. I think it should be read into the record. Is that agreed?

Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN:

At a joint meeting of the Society of Dramatic Authors, the Artists' Union and the Producers' Association which was held on Monday, June 15, 1959, the following resolution was unanimously passed:

1. Whereas the parliamentary committee on radio and television broadcasting now sitting at Ottawa was set up to examine the structure and operation of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for the purpose of improving, if possible, the services which the taxpayers are entitled to expect from that important body;

2. Whereas it has been proved that the French network, despite its imperfections, still ranks among the most efficient in the world;

3. Whereas certain members of parliament sitting on that committee are taking advantage of their parliamentary immunity to utter half-truths, make gratuitous statements and hurl charges at random, for the obvious purpose of making political capital, using methods worthy of all the scandal sheets;

4. Whereas this policy of the said members of parliament is contrary to the rudimentary principles of law, which never permit one or more persons to be tried in their absence, when they cannot defend themselves against the charges made in obvious bad faith;

5. Whereas there is nothing constructive about such an attitude which serves, rather, to bring discredit on the authors, artists, and producers who are the chief architects of the quality and prestige of the French network;

For all these reasons, la Société des auteurs, l'Union des artistes, and l'Association des réalisateurs de Montréal wish to protest vigorously to the Prime Minister of Canada, asking him to put an immediate stop to the anti-democratic methods now being used in the parliamentary

committee on radio and television broadcasting. Such methods in the long run lower the prestige of the people's representatives, whose duty is to work for the greatness of the nation and not to belittle and disparage their fellow-countrymen.

Jean-Louis Roux,
President,
Société des auteurs dramatiques.

Jean Duceppe,
President,
Union des artistes.

Fernand Quirion,
President,
Association des réalisateurs.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: I take it that is a translation?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think we will table it in French and in English so that we will make sure we have the correct translation.

Also, I see in this morning's *Gazette* an item, the final paragraph of which says:

It was also learned the three groups are preparing a brief to be presented to the parliamentary committee.

Are there any comments?

Mr. PICKERSGILL: I am wondering about the propriety. How did this reach the committee?

The CHAIRMAN: It was addressed to M. Halpenny, Président, Comité Parlementaire de la Radio et de la Télévision.

Mr. TREMBLAY (*Interpretation*): For the record, the following is a sight translation of Mr. Tremblay's statement:

1. Whereas the parliamentary committee on broadcasting and television was set up in order to study the mechanism, nature and operations of the C.B.C. with a view to improving, if possible, the services which the taxpayers are entitled to expect from this important body.

2. Whereas the reports and comments of the newspapers and press agencies on the proceedings of the said committee have very often been presented in an incomplete and tendentious manner.

3. Whereas authors, artists and performers came, during the strike of the French network on the television, into my office in parliament to complain of the bad treatment of which they had been victims from the C.B.C., from the poor administration of that firm, and from the scandals which they believe existed in that administration.

4. Whereas I received, again very recently, mainly during the last few weeks and the last few days, letters, telephone calls and visits from performers, authors and producers of the C.B.C. and that these persons communicated with me, congratulating me on the work accomplished in the committee and asking me to continue in the same way.

5. Whereas the members of the said committee have been unable to obtain the names of those responsible for the various administrative services of the C.B.C. and therefore have been unable to say who are the persons responsible as witnesses with a view to examining the administration of the services of the C.B.C.

6. Whereas the committee accepted avoiding direct references to personalities and even to radio and television programs, it has therefore been impossible to obtain the appropriate information.

7. Whereas the members of the committee were obliged to proceed by means of indirect questioning.

8. Whereas the Vice-President of the C.B.C. stated that he was responsible for the acts of the C.B.C. to the members of the committee.

9. Whereas until we have heard from him in respect of the protests found in the telegram which the chairman of the committee has just read.

10. Whereas because of the principles of the government responsible and parliamentary privileges, members of the said committee are entitled to make inquiry on the use of public funds and as a result on the operations of the body which is largely paid for by the taxpayers.

I therefore state that I wish to deny personally the allegations of the submission sent to the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister of Canada, and to the chairman of the parliamentary committee on broadcasting and television, and that I intend to carry on the work undertaken in the committee in complete good faith without regard to persons or personalities, with the sole object of improving this public service of state radio and television in order that the money paid by the taxpayers shall be profitable to the nation and to the taxpayers themselves, and shall be put to good use by the nation and by the taxpayers themselves.

This being so, I have the conviction of simply carrying out the mandate which the taxpayers have asked me to fulfill. Signed John Tremblay, member of parliament for Roberval, and dated June 18, 1959.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Chairman referring to a point of order, this communication read this morning was only one of many communications addressed to the committee. It seems to me that we have a fixed agenda for the deliberations of this committee, and that we agreed to it; therefore we should not have our proceedings disturbed. I take no exception to Mr. Tremblay's statement because it probably is a proper question of privilege. But I do take exception to this communication being put into our record at all unless all the other communications which have been addressed to the committee are going to be similarly treated. I think we ought to make a decision about it.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, gentlemen.

Mr. FISHER: Does Mr. Pickersgill care to make a motion?

Mr. PICKERSGILL: It does not seem to me that there is any motion called for.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pickersgill, I think that this is the first critical communication that we have received. Any other communications that have been received were requests from individuals to appear before the committee, but this is the first communication of this type, and I thought that in fairness to the committee it should be read into the record.

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that every such communication be placed before the steering committee and that they should report to this committee what if anything should be produced.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think that is a good idea. Is that agreeable?

Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes. And in the meantime this should not be made part of the record.

The CHAIRMAN: We are under programming and newscasting.

Mr. FISHER: There are several of us on the committee who are very much interested in this question of the extension of coverage in the hinterland areas. I refer to Mr. Simpson and several others. There is certainly an urgency in this, in that a number of small communities are making plans to spend money for their own particular situations. What I would like to ask is: would it be possible for us to name a day within the next two weeks when we might treat with that particular aspect of the matter? I gathered from Mr. Bushnell that Mr. Richardson is ready and willing to go ahead with it, and that he has all the information.

The CHAIRMAN: If it is agreeable to the committee Part H New Developments can be placed ahead on the agenda. There is no reason why it should not be done.

Mr. FISHER: Does it need a motion, or could we do it a week from to-day?

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Mr. Chairman, I agree that this is important to the group, including Mr. Fisher and Mr. Simpson. My only concern is that we have some other important matters which I hope we will be able to deal with before the adjournment of the house; and if this is delayed, it will mean conceivably that important business—and I refer to the financial structure of the corporation—will then have to be put back to a time when conceivably the committee might not be able to give it its full attention. I suggest that item D is one of the more important items for consideration and I hope it will not be further deferred.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: I think Mr. Fisher has made a very reasonable request; and it just so happens that with the exception of Mr. Simpson, the members who are particularly interested in this matter are nearly all opposition members, and that they have up to now taken very little part in the deliberations of this committee.

I myself happen to be particularly interested in this question of the extension of services. It does seem to me that the suggestion of naming a specific day for that purpose is a very good one and that it ought to be entertained.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I have no objection.

Mr. FISHER: There is one community in my constituency, Nipigon, where the municipality and hundreds of workers are considering whether they should go ahead and make commitments costing the people who go for it about \$400 each, and they want to know whether or not they should go ahead with it. They are being pressed on all sides because there is a time factor. I do not think anything will come out of this committee which is going to help them, but they have to wait to get some indication of what the future plans are.

The CHAIRMAN: The matter will be referred to the steering committee, and I will call a meeting of that committee for this afternoon. Now, we are on Part B, of the Agenda—"Comparison by location of news service showing (a) number of staff, (b) annual cost for (i) radio, and (ii) television." Are there any questions?

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Do we have those comparisons?

Mr. Charles JENNINGS (*Controller of Broadcasting*): They are not ready yet. They are in course of preparation. Probably they will be available in ten days.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): May I have a brief reply? Mr. Jennings was trying to reply to my question.

Mr. JENNINGS: They are not ready yet.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest that we hold over questions about it until it is ready.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: I refer to a question I asked six weeks ago.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it upon this point?

Mr. PICKERSGILL: Yes, it is on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you mind deferring it until our next meeting? They will have the information by then.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would like to know whether or not my question is in the minds of the C.B.C.

The CHAIRMAN: What was your question?

Mr. PICKERSGILL: If I could be permitted to speak for a moment without interruption I would repeat it. My question has to do with the advisability of the C.B.C. engaging its own news-gathering staff here for parliament.

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): That is item (3). I understood that only item (1) was to be held over.

The CHAIRMAN: That is right. We will hold over item (1).

Mr. JENNINGS: The annual cost of 1(b) should be ready by June 30, I am informed.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well. Item (2), "Review of directive and style guide," which we have on page 135 of our proceedings. Are there any questions concerning page 135?

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): Do you receive many complaints about there being non-adherence to the style guide?

Mr. JENNINGS: No, I do not think that we do.

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): Do you receive any?

Mr. JENNINGS: From external sources, do you mean?

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): Yes, or from within your own organization?

Mr. JENNINGS: The news service is composed of a lot of normal human beings, and they do have to be straightened out from time to time by the aid of this style guide. It is something which is continually being brought to the attention of the news staff, especially when any news development indicates that they should be alerted to pay particular attention to an area covered by the style guide.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Perhaps here we might ask Mr. Jennings about the organizational authority for determining the balance—again I use that word—in assessing what will be carried, after an assessment of the news of the day has been made, as a determining factor. Who is the gentleman who makes the decision as to how much of it will be carried.

Mr. JENNINGS: Mr. Smith, that would work all the way up the line, from the editor on duty writing the bulletin, getting his material from the source, selecting it, having the bulletin reviewed by his senior editor on duty and, if necessary, referring it on up to the radio or television editor in charge of the whole system and on up, if necessary, to the chief news editor himself.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Could you cite an example, please, as to whether the authority might purely rest with the news editor as compared with having it sent up to a more senior official; or do you differentiate?

Mr. JENNINGS: I would say this. The editor on duty in charge of writing the bulletin is there to select and to put in the order of priority in which they appear in the bulletin the various stories that come from the sources. He is the main one doing the Canadian Press and the U.P. international. If, in his judgment he feels he should refer the treatment of a particular story, or its inclusion, in the normal course of events he would refer it. I think this is a day-to-day normal working procedure.

Mr. FISHER: In relation to 18.7 and 18.8, in connection with election results and so on, has anyone anything further than a statement that was released to the press a few days ago to the effect that you were going to stand by the explanation made by Mr. Duffy, so far as the Ontario provincial election coverage was concerned?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, so far as we are concerned, we have made a very careful examination of the coverage that was given to the Ontario election on television. I myself would say that there were a couple of weaknesses in it. One weakness was where a bulletin came in which gave an incorrect standing. This was picked up and it was some time—I do not know how long; perhaps half an hour—before it was corrected. It was caught finally by the editor on duty. But in the meantime it had gone up on television tabulation, through the normal flow. It was picked up by one of the announcers in Toronto, and it was also picked up here, where the information was also available.

Mr. FISHER: I knew it was a mistake immediately. I follow provincial election results closely and I must say it led to some temporarily broken hearts in our particular party. I was wondering why you did not catch that mistake sooner.

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not know. They are working under a good deal of pressure; the stuff is flowing in at a great rate and they use it as fast as they can get it. I think it was a source of puzzlement.

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): Was it a C.B.C. mistake or a source mistake?

Mr. JENNINGS: A source mistake. Apart from the C.B.C., that service was going to all private radio stations as well as to all private television stations. It was being used by them in their coverage of the election. How it threw them, I do not know.

Mr. FISHER: They used the “boob” too. What would it have cost to have put the Premier of Ontario on television, live, from Lindsay?

Mr. JENNINGS: I am sorry; I cannot answer that question at the moment.

Mr. FISHER: Was the cost the factor?

Mr. JENNINGS: There were two reasons, Mr. Fisher. The first one was a technical consideration. As I understand it, not being a technical person, in order to put Premier Frost on television, I was told it would have meant an interruption of service of up to two days flowing from the east to the west, service from Ottawa, Montreal and so on. It would have meant an interruption to that extent in order to put him on from Peterboro. In so far as Lindsay is concerned, I understand there would have been some difficult construction encountered.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: Would it have been difficult to put him on from Peterboro?

The CHAIRMAN: Do you have a further question, Mr. Fisher?

Mr. FISHER: During the federal elections, did you experience any difficulty in getting the party leaders to come to the television outlets?

Mr. JENNINGS: In the first election we did not. In the first election we did not get Mr. Coldwell. Mr. Diefenbaker in one case flew down to Regina and in another case to Saskatoon.

Mr. FISHER: Mr. Diefenbaker was prepared to make a move in order to appear before the television cameras.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): What happened to Mr. Coldwell?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think it was impossible for him to reach a television outlet.

Mr. MACQUARRIE: I have a question in connection with 18.9.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Chairman, I had a further question in connection with the Ontario election broadcast.

The CHAIRMAN: We will come back to you in a moment, Mr. Pickersgill; will you proceed, Mr. MacQuarrie?

Mr. MACQUARRIE: I am just wondering if your news gatherers and disseminators take any responsibility for covering a region in a particular area. I recall during the Nova Scotian election campaign the Halifax news room released information on all Nova Scotia provincial nominations, but in various places in the maritimes during that time there were dominion nominations which did not seem to be covered.

Mr. JENNINGS: It is purely a matter of space and time. You cannot do them all. We have to report them. Since we cannot do that, we try to pick out what the directive calls "newsworthy nominations",—not the routine naming of candidates, because it is impossible to carry all of them.

Mr. MACQUARRIE: I wonder if propinquity were the fact, that you covered the Nova Scotian one but not anything beyond that province.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: I wanted to ask a question in connection with the broadcast on television from Ottawa of the Ontario election. I wanted to ask Mr. Jennings if there had been any complaints. Practically throughout the whole evening, once the election had been conceded, it was impossible to get any results through C.B.C. television of any significance at all, other than the Ottawa valley. Their broadcast seemed to be of a frightfully local character. Even in the Ottawa valley a lot of people were interested in the results in Toronto, Windsor, Fort William, Niagara Falls and other parts of the province; but we got a most tedious repetition over and over again of half a dozen or a dozen constituencies in this area of the over-all result and nothing else.

Mr. CHAMBERS: I found those results very interesting.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: I did too; but having heard them a dozen times, I would have liked to hear some of the results from the rest of the province. I was wondering whether there had been any general complaints about the rather parochial character of that.

Mr. JENNINGS: There has been none that reached my ears.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: My main purpose in asking the question was so one would.

Mr. CHAMBERS: In 18.9 there is a statement which reads:

In the same way, routine campaign speeches can be ignored. A sensible procedure is to cover only the party leaders, apart from any particularly newsworthy announcements or unusual breaks.

It seems to me that the policy of the C.B.C., on television particularly, is tremendously important because a newspaper memo like this is probably the greatest former of opinion today. I can see that a policy like that might make sense in Great Britain, but in Canada we have a great diversity of problems in various parts of the nation. The party leaders deal with the national issues; but there are important local issues and there is a tendency in Canada for the individual candidate, the individual member of parliament, to reduce in importance in the minds of the public, partly because of a policy like this.

The CHAIRMAN: And your question is, Mr. Chambers?

Mr. CHAMBERS: My question is, whether this has been recently reviewed with a view, perhaps, to changing the emphasis somewhat, allowing more coverage of local candidates, particularly on local or area questions that are being commentated upon by the candidates in that area.

Mr. JENNINGS: I would think, if you had watched the local Ottawa television station during the campaign, that in the five minutes of local news that is covered. First of all, things of national interest go into the national bulletins, and, where possible, into regional or local television. In television we have

not the regional news bulletins we have in radio. In radio those regional news bulletins cover subjects of regional interest, and in some cases where we have local bulletins—and this is radio. Actually, in television in Montreal and Toronto we are now equipped sufficiently to put on what we call a metro bulletin. News of local interest, or of interest within the range of the station, would be covered.

Mr. CHAMBERS: This has changed since the time of the last federal election, because in the last federal election I noticed the C.B.C. did a good job and covered the national picture. But, whereas local radio stations and newspapers commented on local issues and the local campaign, the C.B.C. was very sparse in its coverage in the Montreal area of the local campaigns and issues.

Mr. JENNINGS: As you know, in Montreal a metro edition has been started since then. It is purely a matter of development and of being able to do a good job of reporting in the area which you serve. By and large, so far in television we broadcast to the national audience with our national television news. It is really a matter of what we are able to do and of the facilities we have at our disposal.

Mr. CHAMBERS: You would expect in the future there would be more possibility of covering local activities during an election?

Mr. JENNINGS: I would think quite definitely, yes.

Mr. FISHER: This is in connection with 18.10, where it deals with the popular vote, and the whole theme of this section is that you should play down anything that has emotional or colour significance. I have no particular quarrel, in so far as the C.B.C. people themselves are concerned, with that; but would it not be possible on television coverage to bring in some local colour, in the way of people who are biased, and some reaction, so we get something which is a little more lively than we have now?

Mr. JENNINGS: It may make for dullness, and we recognize this; but in the long run it makes for balanced and factual reporting, which we think is important.

Mr. FISHER: Are you sure it is not for safety?

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): I object to the expression of the feeling that the Ottawa broadcasting was dull. I think it was far from dull.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think Mr. Fisher was not talking about the coverage of the election, but about our general coverage.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. McCleave?

Mr. McCLEAVE: Two points, Mr. Chairman. The first is with reference to 18.9, nominations, routine campaign speeches. I might say, during the last election campaign at least 10 or 15 minutes of the newscasts in Halifax were devoted to a joint meeting of the candidates there. There was a very newsworthy meeting there, because we had almost a riot at that particular time; but they recognized the newsworthiness of this particular meeting and gave it 10 minutes' coverage.

The CHAIRMAN: What is your question, Mr. McCleave?—Could we keep statements down to a minimum. We are running into statements. Do you have a question to ask on that?

Mr. McCLEAVE: Yes. As a person who at one time did read news for the C.B.C., I am very disappointed in the corporation's policy of hiring outside people—say, from the press gallery in Ottawa, from the newspapers and other sources—during election campaigns, and reducing the role of the C.B.C. news writers to that of glorified clerks. They simply take news reports off

the machines and write them in radio style. I wonder if Mr. Bushnell or Mr. Jennings could make some comment on whether there is a possibility of giving more recognition and the use of microphones to people who are in the C.B.C. news service, who are quite familiar with the rules and regulations and with what the C.B.C. news service does strive to perform?

Mr. JENNINGS: I feel the coverage of the Ontario election was a pretty good example of the sort of thing you are speaking about, where, for the first time—not for the first time going out to make pick-ups from private stations, but for the first time we were taking private stations' own people, people nominated by them, to act as the broadcaster when we switched to those places during the election.

I hope I am not getting away from your question, but this is something we have discussed with our affiliates many times; that is, the use of their own people rather than newspaper men. They feel they are equipped with their own staffs and facilities to do the pick-ups that we call on them for during this kind of broadcasting.

In the last Ontario election I think we had pick-ups from Windsor, Hamilton, Kitchener, Sudbury, London and Ottawa—our own station. But in the case of the private stations our news people met them beforehand on the planning of the coverage of the election, and they suggested and nominated people who would appear from private stations. We discussed it with them; and it was the first time, in this last election, we used their people.

Mr. McCLEAVE: My question was concerned with more use of C.B.C. people themselves in the news rooms, before the microphones and the cameras. My question was not concerned with the arrangements made with the outside stations.

Mr. JENNINGS: We do not do it too widely, but again—and it is freshest in my mind—in the Ontario election you saw the use of Norman DePoe, who played quite a large role in the broadcasting; and he is not a member of our news staff, but is a special C.B.C. reporter.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that we are through with B.2, and we shall go on with B.3: review of proposal to employ new staff to cover parliament? Mr. Pickersgill, you had a question on that?

Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would like, first of all—

The CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Mr. Pickersgill, this is on page 260, 261 and 262.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: I would like, first of all, to speak very briefly on a question of privilege, following the precedent of Mr. Tremblay. I received a telegram after I raised this question. I am not going to attempt to introduce it into the record. I think you also received that telegram, or a similar telegram, Mr. Chairman, from the union in Toronto. In my reply to it I indicated I was not intending, by raising this question, to criticize in any way the competence of the people who were employed or who might be employed here.

My question was an entirely different question. It was one as to whether the corporation, as a corporation, should be a news-gathering service. I would not want it to be thought I discriminate in any way between those people who are employed by the C.B.C. and those who are employed by newspapers. I think that in the main they are good, conscientious and hard working people, just as much in one case as in the other. Some of them I would not agree with entirely, but that is another matter. My point was one of principle: that was that the C.B.C., the corporation itself, was going to be entering into a new field—or what would seem to me to be a new field—and taking the responsibility for news-gathering in parliament itself. In view of the peculiar relation

between the corporation and parliament, I had some doubt about the wisdom of that. I raised it as a question, not as a firm conviction on my part. I would still be very much interested in hearing the argument for doing it. It may be very compelling.

The CHAIRMAN: Just to keep the record straight, I did not receive the wire you referred to, Mr. Pickersgill.

Mr. JENNINGS: Mr. Pickersgill, this is nothing new: the C.B.C. has had a news staff here, in Ottawa, for several years.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: In the gallery?

Mr. JENNINGS: Not in the gallery, but we have been given two seats in, I think it is called, the official gallery. We have had those seats, and we have had certain privileges which Mr. Speaker gave to us—I think, but I am not sure of this—about eighteen months ago. Since that time—as you may recall—the C.B.C. made representations to the Speakers of both houses, asking for a parliamentary broadcasters' gallery, and since that time the press gallery itself has made, I understand, a revision of its rules to permit broadcasters to be full members. It is not new, Mr. Pickersgill.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: That does not really answer my question. I wanted to hear the argument, whether it is new, or whether it is not. Eighteen months, in my book, is still fairly new.

Mr. JENNINGS: It is 18 months since we have had facilities to report parliament.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: It is 18 months since you have had facilities to report parliament. My question did not relate to the reporting of other events; but, in view of the peculiar relationship between the corporation and parliament—I know what the views were years ago about this; I discussed it on a good many occasions with Mr. Dunton—I am still wondering whether it is desirable for the corporation to have the responsibility of news gathering in parliament; whether it would not be very much better for this particular function to be left to the news services. As I say, when I ask that question, I am not expressing an opinion about it. I want to know why the corporation feels it is necessary to do this, and in the public interest.

Mr. JENNINGS: Because we think the news services have limitations so far as radio and television techniques are concerned. The news services are excellent for preparation of written word bulletins. When we do voice reporting on radio or visual reporting on television, we come into another field entirely. We feel there that by the employment of our own people—and especially in the field of covering parliament—if we are able to, as is our intention now, appoint a man here in Ottawa in addition to the staff which is already reporting, we will have a man who can concentrate on factual reporting of parliament in voice reports and in visual reports on television. There is no intention of filing reports—we will still get those from the news agencies—we feel this is part and parcel of the whole developing technique of news reporting on radio, and this has been accelerated, of course, by the need to provide adequate television techniques.

Mr. FISHER: We have touched on this problem already; it is sort of the other side of the plane from Mr. Pickersgill's approach. Do you not think it may be a problem that your use of, let us say, private people as interpreters of the Ottawa scene may subvert their own integrity, in that a considerable part of their income may come from the C.B.C., and so may lead to the very kind of restriction upon their freedom—in a mental sense—that Mr. Pickersgill is worrying about the C.B.C. people being in.

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not know whether I should labour the use of the word "interpretation"; but there are two factors to this: the first is, that in this

kind of daily reporting you have to have—in my view—a man who is part of the whole machinery of your set-up, who works through the chain of responsibility to the central news room, and who does it as a day to day part of his working life.

The other side of this is the difficulty of getting people to report. You have always got to get out and scurry for somebody to do it. In addition to that is the fact that we try to keep a frightfully clearcut line between our opinion broadcasts and our news reporting—and this is always a difficulty. Every fellow you meet is not a good broadcaster for radio; he is not a good broadcaster for television. Therefore, the available pool is inclined to be used both in opinion broadcasting and in news broadcasting.

We think this, again, is the advantage of having our own parliamentary correspondents, who will be here, to report factually to our two news services about the proceedings in parliament.

Mr. FISHER: That will ease, to a certain extent, the kind of interpretive work done by people you hire?

Mr. JENNINGS: Not of interpretive work. We do not intend to put on the staff a person who will give opinion broadcasting; we intend to put on the staff, for both the English and the French network, a correspondent—I do not know how you would describe him, but a man who would do factual reporting.

He will not report his opinion; he will report the opinions of others. I do not know how you would compare him—whether it would be with the New York Times correspondent or the London Times correspondent. But that is the kind of reporting we want to have done; it is straight news reporting.

Mr. FISHER: Have you been approached within the last year by the press gallery as an organization with any views or opinions on this particular matter?

The CHAIRMAN: Can you answer that, Mr. Jennings?

Mr. JENNINGS: I cannot answer that. As far as I know, no. On the use of their members, do you mean?

Mr. FISHER: Yes; and some sort of spreading out of the use, so that more people had the opportunity to get in on the cash register?

Mr. JENNINGS: No, we have not.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Mr. Jennings, you have stated the fact that you have a very real need for your own reporting staff, and I think that is understandable. There seems to me to be occasions when you prefer to use a report from a straight news service. I cite as an example the reporting on the activity of this committee, when there are invariably—I have been told—wire service reports. When do you think it is better to use interpretive reporting or to merely take the reporting of the news service as such? And is there any particular reason for this? Is it just human nature—you do not wish to enter into the field of what may be of a controversial nature?

Mr. JENNINGS: When you say “interpretive reporting”, what do you mean?

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Perhaps I may say, you obviously use your own staff because they are familiar with the detail of, perhaps, the atmosphere of the circumstance or the event, and they will add something—as you have said yourself—which the news service may not have included in its particular bulletin. To begin with, it will be somewhat more extensive reporting of the wire news service.

Are there not times when you are inclined to take the shorter course and use purely the news service, rather than have your own person making his report?

Mr. JENNINGS: Let me make it clear that it was not in a case where the news services did not supply material. I tried to make it clear that it is a question of

technique. The news services supply a budget of news, which is very suitable for written bulletins. In radio and television we think of voice reporting and visual reporting as being part of the very nature of the mediums. For that matter, on television I suppose we could have a news reader who is sitting there reading a written bulletin; but we found, in the beginning of television, that this just was not sufficient, that we had to develop the techniques and make the proceedings interesting.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I understand that. But my point, specifically, is this: you have two choices; your own reporter can produce a story, it can be edited and can be read over the television news of the C.B.C., or he can take purely the course of reading a Canadian Press dispatch, which will be so named. There are occasions when you prefer to take the latter course, rather than a member of your own news staff develop the story himself. report form a reporter in Ottawa or whether it should be covered off the wire

Mr. JENNINGS: I would not give a sort of professional answer as to what happens at the news editor's desk when he decides whether it should be a news report from a reporter in Ottawa or whether it should be covered off the wire services.

I think that is a matter of the story itself, and I certainly would not think there would be that sort of inhibition in his mind. I think his job would be to try to keep that reporting as effective and factual as possible.

But we come back to this one thing. You mentioned a Canadian Press dispatch being read and identified. We would not use a special reporter to read a Canadian Press dispatch off the wire; this would go into the bulletin.

The CHAIRMAN: This could go on for a week, Mr. Smith. Have you one further question?

Mr. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Smith was under a delusion. Your reporters do not file stories on teletype to be read in Toronto or Montreal, do they?

Mr. JENNINGS: They do voice reporting.

Mr. CHAMBERS: They put it on tape, in other words?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERS: This type of material is not available from any other source, is it?

Mr. JENNINGS: This kind of voice reporting or camera reporting is not available any place else. As far as Canadian coverage is concerned, as we may have explained earlier, there is no source in Canada other than the C.B.C. or private stations for getting news film coverage for television. Indeed, in an attempt to improve that situation, in so far as national coverage is concerned, the C.B.C. three years ago or more took the initiative in forming a news cooperative service of which it is a member and of which, I think, now eight stations are members. This supplies news which is sent out across Canada.

Mr. FISHER: I still find a paradox in the statement made by Mr. Bushnell on page 261 where he says:

Extending back to war days, we have been building up a staff of foreign correspondents and their first hand reports by voice and film give authority and distinction to our news broadcasts. Only in such a way could we get the news in broadcast form as seen through Canadian eyes.

Then he goes on:

In one respect we feel we are behind the times, in not covering our own capital as thoroughly as we should perhaps do.

You have, let us say, persons like Mr. Keatley and Mr. Minifie who do work for you. I insist the majority of their broadcasts are interpretive. The persons you will have in Ottawa will not be interpreters but will be factual reporters. Is there not a bit of a cross-purpose?

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not think there is a cross-purpose. I think there is a slight degree of distinction in that Mr. Minifie could probably stray into the interpretive field on certain subject areas, whereas we would not consider we were able to do it on national or purely Canadian topics. I think there is a slight flexibility.

The CHAIRMAN: We are bringing personalities into this again and I do not think we should do so.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: I have a question. I must say I would like to preface this by saying I am very much reassured by what has been said about these being purely factual broadcasts. It seems to me, as much as one can distinguish between fact and interpretation, there is much less objection to this. Does the C.B.C. feel it would be quite improper for the corporation to have on its staff persons who undertake to interpret news and interpret proceedings of parliament?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes; I think it would be.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: So do I.

Mr. McCLEAVE: Does this really not boil down to the fact that you should make more use of the man whom you now have here from the C.B.C.—I will not mention his name; everybody will know him—on these broadcasts, which should result in some savings, instead of using members of the press gallery as much as you now do.

Mr. FISHER: Hear, hear.

Mr. JENNINGS: I know, in respect of the pure work load, our consideration is that in this factual reporting job—and again I emphasize for voice and television reporting—we feel we must have another man here. I cannot tell you how the work load will be distributed, but I imagine the person here at the moment is probably a pretty busy fellow.

Mr. McCLEAVE: Is it not a statement of fact that frequently when you do use members of the press gallery they are used more in reporting than in interpretive roles?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERS: On this question of the balance between interpretive and factual reporting, and the striving for factual reporting, how much do you try to control it in an area outside of Ottawa? One of your reporters recently has announced his own foreign policy in a speech which, as far as I know, is not—

Mr. PICKERSGILL: On a point of order; how does Mr. Chambers relate this to item B3? It does not deal with proposals to employ new staff in Ottawa.

Mr. CHAMBERS: I think I can relate it. The C.B.C. proposes to employ new staff in Ottawa and they have newsgathering staffs in other parts of the world. There seems to be a difficulty, which Mr. Pickersgill has raised, of maintaining factual reporting and unbiased reporting. How do you propose to keep it factual?

Mr. JENNINGS: In this case of which you speak, of one of our reporters, as you say, pronouncing his own foreign policy, unless it has slipped by, they are taking steps to rap him over the knuckles.

Mr. FISHER: I do not believe he did that in a C.B.C. broadcast.

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not know to what Mr. Chambers is referring.

The CHAIRMAN: We must not get into personalities.

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): When this new proposal comes into effect, I am not clear as to whether or not in the actual newscasts the C.B.C. will cease to use members of the press gallery entirely.

Mr. JENNINGS: I would say, certainly not. Incidentally, it is not a new policy; it is a growth of the service, if you want to put it that way. There may well be times when one person alone will not be able to fill the need for factual reporting about any particular topic.

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): Members of the press gallery will be used only for fill-in.

Mr. JENNINGS: I would not say only for fill-in. It is purely a day by day working problem. If a man cannot do it, is too busy and we must do something, I think we add to it.

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): Directly associated with this, what is your plan for coverage of the legislatures? Is there any special plan to have C.B.C. men in Quebec city and in Toronto?

Mr. JENNINGS: We already do this. We already, Mr. Bell, do this within limitations of staff, finance, and so on. We do cover the legislatures. Just how thoroughly, I do not know. I do not know if at any point we have a man whose job is merely to cover the legislature.

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): You do not set up in each provincial capital a complete staff for the purpose of covering the legislature?

Mr. JENNINGS: This would be very difficult.

Mr. McCLEAVE: Could we have the amounts paid to members, say, of the press gallery in Ottawa for their contributions to the national news bulletins? I am not thinking of Press Conference or other broadcasts; I am thinking entirely in terms of the news broadcasts. Would it be possible to have this for a month, a six-month period, or some other period?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask approximately how many man-hours it would take to get this information? Ladies and gentlemen, we have decided that any further requests for information will go to the steering committee before they are accepted.

Mr. A. M. HENDERSON (*Comptroller, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*): If we are to obtain that information for a month, I do not think it would take very long.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it agreeable we ask for that information?

Mr. FISHER: Do you want the names?

Mr. McCLEAVE: No; the amount and the number of contributions.

Mr. CHAMBERS: Have you any rules regarding staff, I mean persons who work for you in the news area, working for other publications and drawing income?

The CHAIRMAN: Do you mean here in Ottawa? We are reviewing this question of employing new staff to cover parliament here.

Mr. CHAMBERS: Yes.

Mr. JENNINGS: We have a general rule for our staff about outside work where permission for doing anything outside is reviewed and approval or otherwise is given to the specific request. I am told this is so except where provided under labour agreements.

Mr. CHAMBERS: If you had a newsman here and he was also employed as a stringer or occasional contributor to some publication which might have a political bias one way or the other, you might be running into a situation there of difficulty.

Mr. JENNINGS: We would be, and this is something we watch very carefully. For example, we would not only so far as newsmen are concerned, but so far as straight news readers are concerned, watch this very carefully, so that no one, even a news reader, would get a reputation which might in a sense lead people to believe he was coloured in the way he read the news. We are very strict about this.

Mr. CHAMBERS: Some of your people do work for other publications?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, and in those cases specific permission has been given and it is watched very carefully to see that in no way this work reflects on the news service.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we are getting away from the field.

Mr. FISHER: Does not the same problem exist, Mr. Jennings, in so far as the free lancers are concerned that you hire here in Ottawa?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions under part B, item 3?

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how the C.B.C. intends to hire these Ottawa representatives. I am looking at Mr. Bushnell's statement and I do not see any indication. Will they have to be hired through the Montreal office, or the Toronto office, or through the Ottawa office, if and when you employ new staff?

Mr. JENNINGS: I cannot tell you what the machinery would be, or whether they would be hired from Toronto or Montreal. But I do know that at the moment we have been looking at kine-recordings of the people who are likely to be considered for the job, and when we are agreed that this or that person is the one for the job, then formal hiring machinery will soon get into action, with a complete job description and everything else, and headquarters at Ottawa would approve it.

Mr. JOHNSON: What department is in closest relation to this matter?

Mr. JENNINGS: The news department.

Mr. JOHNSON: At Ottawa?

Mr. JENNINGS: The national headquarters in Toronto, and the French headquarters at Montreal; but it would still have to be approved here.

Mr. JOHNSON: By Ottawa?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: Is it not likely to be made through promotion within the C.B.C.?

Mr. JENNINGS: That I cannot tell you. But it is our policy to make such promotions.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we can move forward to item (4) now:

"Integration of supervisory and editorial staff of radio and television services."

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): Are there separate supervisory and editorial staffs for each service?

Mr. JENNINGS: The whole service is headed by the chief news editor. He has three people reporting to him, the supervisor of news, French; the general news editor; and the general supervisor of television news. They report to the chief news editor and it is an integrated function in the sense that these people have an overall responsibility.

There is a general supervisor of television news, and a general news editor. These people work very closely together in Toronto, and they have a particular responsibility with respect to radio and television. They do overlap in consultation to a certain extent. These are really the only integrated positions. Other positions are at points outside of Montreal and Toronto, with a senior news official in charge. They are physically separate in every other place except at Winnipeg.

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): Would it not be advisable to develop some degree of integration with a consequent saving?

Mr. JENNINGS: I would think that the matter of space is involved. In the assignment of stories I think that integration would probably be a good thing, but I do not think it would be a good thing in the preparation of stories, because the techniques are completely different.

Mr. MUIR (*Lisgar*): Are they integrated?

Mr. JENNINGS: They are not integrated as staffs. They are not integrated, in this sense, that at several places they have separate sources of information; in other words they have their own batteries of printers, and so on. In Winnipeg, because of purely physical and local conditions, they work in the same area. But there are separate staffs which write and prepare television and radio bulletins.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions on this item?

Mr. FISHER: Are supervisory personnel allowed to be members of a union?

Mr. JENNINGS: No.

The CHAIRMAN: Part "C".

Mr. FORGIE: Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by Mr. Pickersgill, that the premier of the province of Ontario be invited to come before this committee to set forth his views and grievances against the C.B.C.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: You said this would be the appropriate place to make the motion.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Mr. Chairman, we have a great deal of work ahead of us, and we have other agencies in addition to the corporation to be heard. I suggest it would be inappropriate at this time for us to hear individual representations from people—regardless of how distinguished a person the premier of Ontario is; and if we were to hear all these complaints against the corporation, we would certainly never finish our work. I suggest we might even have to call Mr. Pickersgill himself under those circumstances.

I therefore suggest that it be deferred until at least we complete the initial business we set out to hear.

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): I agree that it should be deferred, but I would be interested to hear the views of the premier of Ontario. However I do not think we should interrupt our program at this stage.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Chairman, the motion does not suggest—and I do not think my friend suggests—that we should interrupt our consideration of this agenda. But obviously Mr. Frost is a very busy man, with very many preoccupations. It might be very difficult for him to tear himself away from

Lindsay on a specific day. I suggest therefore that he ought to be given a lot of notice. And it seems to me that we ought to decide on the principle now, and to invite Mr. Frost, and we should as far as possible suit ourselves to his convenience.

I would not go so far as to suggest that the committee should adjourn to Lindsay to hear Mr. Frost. But in view of the fact that he is premier of one of the largest and most populous provinces, and has made a public statement in which he said that public broadcasting should be abolished in this country for reasons which he seemed to consider sufficient, it does seem to me we should hear him. Mr. Frost is not exactly a nobody—as the recent election proved; and it does seem to me that since he is a conservative, it would be interesting to know how many other conservatives agree with that policy which was certainly enunciated as the policy of the federal conservative party—and in view of his prominence and his importance in this matter, I think it would be very desirable to give him an opportunity to come here at some stage without interrupting this program, in order to hear his grievances, and to hear him explain why he thinks that public broadcasting should be done away with in Canada.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: Mr. Chairman, as this house will likely be sitting for another six to eight weeks, I do not think it would interfere with the proceedings of this committee if the motion were approved and accepted by the committee. Mr. Frost would have plenty of warning, and it would not interfere with our regular proceedings.

Mr. FISHER: I would like to speak in support of the motion. It seems to me that this has been the most harsh criticism of the C.B.C. to be expressed by a prominent political figure in my memory. It went far beyond the election night coverage. The very principle upon which the C.B.C. is based is involved. I think for that reason it is most important for us to have this gentleman appear before the committee.

Mr. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, this type of motion has come up before in these committees, to call various people whose views might be of interest to the committee. And as Mr. Smith said, there are a number of other Canadians who would like to make known their views of the C.B.C., some of them critical and some otherwise. Many of these people are also very prominent. It would be impossible to hear them all. Therefore I suggest that the motion be referred to the steering committee for recommendation.

Mr. MUIR (*Lisgar*): I think to invite individuals to testify before this committee would be setting a precedent that would probably involve a lot of trouble for us. There are other very prominent men who have decided views on this matter and I think we would have to hear them as well, if they wished to come. We would never get through with our work.

Mr. FORGIE: We have had no others express a view such as that expressed by the Premier of Ontario. He said virtually, "I am out to kill the C.B.C.", and we want to hear what he has to say about that.

Mr. JOHNSON: He did not say that.

Mr. FORGIE: He did.

Mr. JOHNSON: What do you mean by "virtually"?

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we are getting out of hand. Mr. McCleave?

Mr. MCCLEAVE: According to our terms of reference on Wednesday, April 29, 1959, we are not empowered to present any recommendations to the House of Commons and parliament that the C.B.C. be scrapped and I think the motion on that ground alone is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Flynn, you are next.

Mr. FLYNN: The agenda does not refer to the principles and the extent of the C.B.C., so no one in the committee should ask to discuss this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you anything else to say?

Mr. FLYNN: No.

Mr. FORGIE: The interpretation put on this by the member for Halifax is an impossible one.

Mr. FISHER: Is CARTB coming before this committee?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. FISHER: I think the views of the Premier of Ontario are as important for us to hear as CARTB.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, you will recall that following the original meeting of the steering committee, our suggestion at that time. It was agreed that the three groups would be called, that is the C.B.C., the C.A.B. and the B.B.G., and then if we had time to call any individuals we could—if there is any time left.

Does anyone else wish to speak to the motion?

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment to the motion—that all provincial premiers and all prominent people who have complaints against the C.B.C. be asked to come and speak before this committee.

Mr. TREMBLAY (*Interpretation*): I second the motion.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: The Premier of Quebec will never come here to appear before the C.B.C.

Mr. TREMBLAY (*Interpretation*): What do you know about the Premier of the province of Quebec?

The CHAIRMAN: Just a moment, gentlemen; this is no place to fight.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): There is a motion, Mr. Chairman, to refer it to the steering committee.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: An amendment has been proposed. Has it been seconded?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, it was seconded by Mr. Tremblay.

Mr. JOHNSON: I said not only the premiers but all prominent people, and this to take place at the end of the agenda.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: This is irrelevant because no other premier of any other province has objected, officially at least, in regard to the C.B.C.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): What do you mean by “objected officially”?

Mr. FISHER: Mr. Chairman, I would be willing to vote for this motion if the man who moved it would inform me as to the scope of his phrase “prominent people”.

Mr. JOHNSON: Well, for example, those who are in private television and private radio.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: We have agreed already to hear them.

Mr. FISHER: We are hearing them.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I suggest, Mr. Chairman, the amendment was introduced to show how difficult it would be under the circumstances. As yet we have not completed one-third of the business that we have before us. My suggestion is that this be deferred until we at least determine how long we are going to be with the outline which you have given us and then at that time consideration could be given to having further witnesses appear before this committee.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to support the amendment without any equivocation. I think it is redundant and unnecessary, but it would at least accomplish the same purpose as the original motion. It is obviously moved for one purpose only and that is to get the Tory party out of an acute embarrassment.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: I suggest, rather than going on with this discussion, we divide the committee, on the amendment and the motion, and get it over with.

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): Mr. Pickersgill has made it quite evident this is a pure political manoeuvre, that he is totally disinterested in this, but is only interested, as he always is, in playing politics.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: As a matter of fact, I have a question of privilege, but I am not even going to waste my breath on Mr. Bell.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, please! Mr. Muir?

Mr. MUIR (*Lisgar*): I do not think the committee should waste time listening to these long-winded statements, and suggest that members confine their remarks to questions.

The CHAIRMAN: I noticed this morning, Mr. Muir, we spent over half the time on statements. I realize that, and we will certainly govern ourselves accordingly in the next meeting.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: Is this a free parliament? Are we to be subjected to closure?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pickersgill, may I remind you that the purpose of this committee is to ask questions and not to make statements. That is all I have to say.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: May I ask the chairman who defined that purpose?

The CHAIRMAN: The steering committee did; and you were there.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: Not to my recollection. There was no suggestion of this sort made by the steering committee; certainly none I know of.

Mr. CHAMBERS: I move this motion be sent to the steering committee, and I am prepared to include the amendment with it. I think that is the proper place to deal with that matter.

Mr. KUCHEREPA: I will second that.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a motion before this committee, and it must be dealt with. There is also an amendment to the motion.

The amendment, moved by Mr. Johnson and seconded by Mr. Tremblay, is that, "All provincial premiers and other prominent persons be invited to appear at the end of the committee's hearings." That is the amendment. All in favour of the amendment?

Mr. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, if I am out of order the other way, I will move a sub-amendment.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: The motion has been put and, on a point of order, there cannot be any further amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion has been put and Mr. Pickersgill is quite right, Mr. Chambers; I am sorry.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: On a point of order, should not the motion read, "Premiers who have complaints"?

The CHAIRMAN: The motion reads that "All provincial premiers and other prominent persons be invited to appear at the completion of the committee's hearings." That is the amendment. Are you ready for the question, gentlemen? Those in favour; those opposed?

I declare the amendment lost, nine to seven.

Are we ready for the question on the motion?

Mr. CHAMBERS: No, Mr. Chairman, may I now move my amendment, to add to the motion these words, "This matter to be referred to the steering committee"?

The CHAIRMAN: Do you have a seconder?

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I wonder if I might ask for an explanation of that. I assume the new amendment suggests that consideration will be given to calling any other witnesses including, of course, the premier, if and when we have time. Is that the purport of your amendment?

Mr. CHAMBERS: No, the amendment is tacked on to Mr. Pickersgill's motion, which is that—

Mr. PICKERSGILL: That is not my motion, but Mr. Forgie's.

Mr. CHAMBERS: Mr. Forgie's motion is that—

The CHAIRMAN: I will read Mr. Forgie's motion, "that the premier of Ontario be invited to attend this committee and set forth his views and grievances against the C.B.C." That is the motion.

Mr. CHAMBERS: My amendment is to add to that the words, "if recommended by the steering committee."

The CHAIRMAN: Your amendment was seconded by Dr. Kucherepa. Any discussion on the amendment, gentlemen? Ready for the question? The amendment reads: that the premier of Ontario be invited to attend this committee and set forth his views and grievances against the C.B.C.—if recommended by the steering committee.

Mr. KUCHEREPA: Mr. Chairman, that was not the amendment; the amendment was to send this back to the steering committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish the mover and the seconder of the amendment would get together. What is the amendment?

Mr. CHAMBERS: . . . "if recommended by the steering committee"—which, in effect, sends the motion to the steering committee.

The CHAIRMAN: That is what I said: you are adding that on to Mr. Forgie's motion.

Mr. CHAMBERS: That is right.

Mr. KUCHEREPA: I withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you have another seconder, Mr. Chambers? Are we ready for the motion?

The VICE CHAIRMAN (*Mr. Flynn*): No, Mr. Chairman; I would move that consideration of this motion be adjourned until we have completed the agenda.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I would second that, if it has not been seconded.

The CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Flynn, seconded by Mr. Smith: that this be deferred until all our agenda is completed.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: Mr. Flynn made a motion; I do not know that it needs any amendment by Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): You have been assisting every other person who has moved an amendment in here today.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: Are you using me as a model?

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Heaven forbid; I would be wrong, if I did.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion, then, gentlemen, is—moved by Mr. Flynn, seconded by Mr. Smith of Calgary: that this be deferred until the committee

has considered the entire agenda. Are we ready for the question? All in favour of Mr. Flynn's and Mr. Smith's motion? Contrary, if any? Twelve to five in favour of the motion. Thank you, gentlemen.

Next week we will meet on Monday morning at the same time. The B.B.G. will be with us.

THE FOLLOWING IS THE TEXT OF THAT PART OF THE
COMMITTEE'S PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED IN
THE FRENCH LANGUAGE

ON TROUVERA CI-DESSOUS LE TEXTE DE LA PARTIE DES DÉLIBÉRATIONS
DU COMITÉ QUI S'EST DÉROULÉE EN FRANÇAIS

(Page 446)

M. TREMBLAY: Monsieur le président, je voudrais, à ce propos, faire une déclaration.

Premièrement, attendu que le comité parlementaire de la radio et de la télévision a été constitué pour étudier le mécanisme et le fonctionnement de la société Radio-Canada, dans le but d'améliorer, si possible, les services que les contribuables sont en droit d'attendre de cet important organisme;

Deuxièmement, attendu que les rapports et les commentaires des journaux et des agences de presse sur les délibérations dudit comité ont été très souvent présentés de façon incomplète, inexacte et tendancieuse;

Troisièmement, attendu que des auteurs, des artistes et des réalisateurs sont venus, lors de la grève du réseau français de télévision, dans mon bureau du Parlement, se plaindre des mauvais traitements dont ils étaient les victimes de la part de la société Radio-Canada, de la mauvaise administration de ladite société et des scandales qu'ils croyaient voir dans cette administration;

Quatrièmement, attendu que j'ai reçu tout récemment encore, soit au cours des dernières semaines et des derniers jours, des lettres, des appels téléphoniques et des visites d'artistes, d'auteurs et de réalisateurs de Radio-Canada et que ces personnes qui ont communiqué avec moi me félicitaient pour le travail accompli au comité et me demandaient de continuer dans cette voie;

Cinquièmement, attendu que les membres dudit comité n'ont pu obtenir les noms des responsables des divers services administratifs de Radio-Canada et n'ont pu, de ce fait, citer ces responsables comme témoins afin d'examiner l'administration des services mis en cause;

Sixièmement, attendu que le comité a accepté d'éviter les références directes aux personnes et même aux programmes de radio et de télévision, et que partant il a été impossible d'obtenir les renseignements utiles;

Septièmement, attendu que les membres du comité ont été obligés de procéder par voie de questions indirectes;

Huitièmement, attendu que le vice-président de la société Radio-Canada a déclaré se rendre responsable des actes de ladite société devant les membres du comité;

Neuvièmement, attendu qu'il n'a, jusqu'à présent, fait entendre aucune protestation du genre de celles qu'on trouve dans le télégramme que vient de lire le président du comité;

Dixièmement, attendu qu'en vertu des principes du gouvernement responsable et des privilèges parlementaires, les membres dudit comité ont le droit de faire enquête sur l'utilisation des deniers publics et par conséquent sur le fonctionnement d'un organisme dont les contribuables soldent en grande partie les frais;

Je déclare que je récusé, en ce qui me concerne, les allégués du télégramme adressé au très honorable premier ministre du Canada et au président du comité parlementaire de la radio et télévision; que j'entends poursuivre le travail entrepris au comité en toute bonne foi, sans égard aux personnes, dans le seul but d'améliorer ces services que sont la radio et télévision d'État, et cela pour que l'argent des payeurs de taxes soit profitable à la nation et aux contribuables eux-mêmes. Ce faisant, j'ai la conviction de remplir simplement le mandat que les contribuables m'ont demandé de remplir.

* * * *

(Page 462)

M. TREMBLAY: Qu'est-ce qu'il sait de lui?

